



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,564	10/11/2001	Paul G. Allen	10003.001100 (digeo 129)	7500

32641 7590 01/02/2004

DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100
ONE UTAH CENTER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

WILSON, JACQUELINE B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

12

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/975,564

Applicant(s)

Allen

Examiner
Jacqueline Wilson

Art Unit
2612



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 2, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-19, and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-19, and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION II

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/02/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe (US 6,366,311) in view of Wissman (US 6,415,094).**

Regarding Claim 1, Monroe'311 teaches a camera controller (see fig. 2), a plurality of physically-separate addressable power switches (fig. 5, 96, also fig. 3, 100), wherein each power switch comprises a receiver (120, 122, 124, 126, etc.), an output device (fig. 3, 55), and a switch controller (54) for addressing the plurality of power switches. However, Monroe'311 fails to

Art Unit: 2612

teach each addressable power switch comprises a wireless receiver for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch off power to the corresponding camera. However, Wissman'094 teaches a power switch (fig. 3, 36) having a wireless receiver for supplying or switching off power to the camera (20). Wissman'094 further teaches a switch controller (30) has a transmitter (16) for transmitting control signals to the power switch, which is integrated with the camera (see fig. 3), so that power is applied to a single video camera. It would have been obvious to use this wireless receivers and transmitters in Monroe'311 for the purpose of providing greater mobility of the user and eliminating the inconvenience of using a wire for communication purposes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the addressable switch to include a wireless receiver for supplying or switching off power to the video camera and a wireless transmitter for transmitting the control signals to the addressable power switches so power is applied to a single video camera.

Claim 2 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1. (See rejection of Claim 1 above.)

Regarding Claim 4, Monroe'311 teaches the wireless transmitter is configured to transmit radio frequency signal to the wireless receivers, and wherein the wireless receivers are configured to receive radio frequency signals from the wireless transmitter (61 and 118).

Regarding Claim 5, Monroe'311 teaches the switch controller is integrated into the camera controller (see fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding Claim 7, Monroe'311 teaches that the camera control process provides commands from remote access controllers to the camera controller (col. 2, lines 35+).

Regarding Claim 10, Monroe teaches that it is notoriously well known in the art to have a plurality of cameras transmitting wireless signals to an output device (see fig. 6). This provides transmission of video signals without the use of wire and enables easier installation of the video cameras and the output device.

Claim 11 is analyzed and discussed with respect to claim 1 with the further limitation of a memory configured with a camera control process. Monroe'311 teaches firmware or software used to operate the camera system (7, lines 24+). Although Monroe'311 discloses that specific configuration of the control system with respect to the memory is discretionary and is within the purview of those of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious that a communication bus is coupled to the memory for transmitting appropriate codes from the camera control process for the purpose of operating the system using the corresponding commands as desired by the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have a communication bus coupled to the memory for transmitting command codes from the control process.

Claim 14 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1. (See rejection of Claim 1 above.)

Art Unit: 2612

5. Claims 6, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe (US 6,366,311), Wissman (US 6,415,094) in view of Ogasawara (US 6,543,052).

Regarding Claim 6, Monroe'311 fails to teach the camera controller is integrated into customer premises equipment that is communicatively coupled to a cable network. However, Ogasawara'052 teaches a set-top box (STB) which is coupled to cable providers, Internet Service Provider (ISP), to name a few (col. 3, lines 52+), and is also capable of controlling various peripheral devices such as a camera printer, etc. (see fig. 1). Ogasawara'052 teaches that by controlling the peripheral devices using a centralized control through the STB helps facilitate their access and management (col. 4, lines 1-3). This would be advantageous in Monroe'311 for controlling the plurality cameras by using an STB such that all devices may be controlled along with a variety of other devices and providers. The STB also gives the system versatility by including cable connections as well as Internet service for transmitting and receiving video images from remote locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to integrate the controller of Monroe'311 into a customer premises equipment (such as a STB) that is communicatively coupled to a cable network for producing a multifaceted device capable of transmitting and receiving information.

Claims 16 and 17 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Claim 18 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Art Unit: 2612

6. **Claims 8, 9, 12-13, 15, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe (US 6,366,311), Wissman (US 6,415,094) in view of Bellman, Jr. et al. (4,831,438).**

Regarding Claims 8 and 9, Monroe'311 fails to teach an authentication process limits commands accepted to only authorized commands or an encryption process provides security to video signals transmitted from the camera controller to a remote access controller. However, Bellman, Jr teaches that it is notoriously well known in the art to have a surveillance system that includes an authentication process (col. 4, lines 39+) and an encryption process (fig. 1, 470). This prevents unauthorized activation of the system or interception of the surveillance information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Monroe'311 with Bellman, Jr for providing secure access to the surveillance system by using authentication and encryption processes.

Claims 12 and 13 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 8 and 9. Although, Bellman, Jr fails to specifically teach a memory is configured with the authentication process and encryption process, one having ordinary skill would recognize that it would be essential to store these processes in a storage area for storing program codes needed to activate each process for securing access in surveillance systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the memory for storing an authentication and encryption processes.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding Claim 15, Monroe'311 fails to specifically teach the switch controller comprises a decoder for decoding the command codes to generate the control signals. However, Bellman, Jr teaches a switch controller (referred to as an integral module 100) which includes a decoder (170) for decoding command codes. Bellman, Jr specifically discloses that commands are encrypted to prevent unauthorized operation of the surveillance system and decrypted by the decoder (170) for generating control signals for the switch means (col. 3, lines 21+). It would have been obvious to include this process in Monroe'311 for the purpose of creating a secure environment for transmitting and receiving data in surveillance systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Monroe'311 with Bellman, Jr by including the switch controller comprising a decoder for decoding the command codes to generate the control signals.

Claim 19 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 11-13. (Claim 19 is a method of Claims 11-13. See rejection of Claims 11-13 above.)

Claim 21 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 3 and 4. (See rejection of Claims 3 and 4 above.)

Regarding Claim 22, Monroe'311 teaches that the surveillance system includes a plurality of cameras in an aircraft as discussed in Claim 21 (2). This inherently indicates that the command is received from a local system within the premises of the customer such that operation and supervision are performed within the area of the surveillance system.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding Claim 23, Monroe'311 teaches the plurality of cameras are placed about a premises of a customer, and the command is received from a remote system outside the premises of the customer (ground link col. 2, lines 35+).

Claim 24 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2612

8. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to **Jacqueline Wilson** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday (alternate Fridays off) from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached at (703) 305-4929. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

JBW

December 24, 2003


NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER